The American Political Science Review

BOARD OF EDITORS

Hugh L. Elsbree, Managing Editor,
Library of Congress

V. O. Key, Jr., Associate Editor,
Harvard University

James L. McCamy, Associate Editor,
University of Wisconsin

Taylor Cole,
Duke University

Henry W. Ehrmann,
University of Colorado

Harvey C. Mansfield,
Ohio State University

C. Herman Pritchett,
University of Chicago

Francis O. Wilcox,
Washington, D. C.

VOLUME XLVII
1953

GEORGE BANTA PUBLISHING COMPANY
MENASHA, WISCONSIN

CONTENTS

NUMBER 1—MARCH, 1953

Some Present-Day Critics of Liberalism. *Francis W. Coker* 1
The American Idea of International Interest. *Thomas I. Cook and Malcolm Moos.* 28
Party Preference and Attitudes on Political Issues: 1948–1951. *Warren E. Miller.* 45
The Implementation of the Italian Constitution. *John Clarke Adams and Paolo Barile* 61
The Politics of Management Improvement in the States. *Karl A. Bosworth* 84
The Hoover Commission's Personnel Recommendations—A Progress Report. *Harold H. Leich* 100
Constitutional Law in 1951–1952. *David Fellman* 126
Short Articles and Notes
Notes on the Theory of Political Opinion Formation. *Avery Leiserson* 171
The Government Sector of the American Economy. *Elmer B. Staats* 178
Some Aspects of the Security Problem in the Middle East. *Halford L. Hoskins* 188
The Japanese General Election of 1952. *Paul S. Dull* 199
Book Reviews, Notes, and Bibliography. *Emmette S. Redford (ed.)* 205
News and Notes. *Albert Lee Sturm (ed.)* 273

NUMBER 2—JUNE, 1953

Libertarian Motivations on the Vinson Court. *C. Herman Pritchett* 321
The Two-Party System in British Politics. *Leslie Lipson* 337
Political Issues and the Vote: November, 1952. *Angus Campbell, Gerald Gurin, and Warren E. Miller* 359
The Region of Isolationism. *Ralph H. Smuckler* 386
Agrarian Syndicalism in Postwar France. *Gordon Wright* 402
An American View of European Union. *Arthur N. Holcombe* 417
Political Factors in U. S. International Financial Cooperation, 1945–1950. *Jack N. Behrman* 431
Nature over Art: No More Local Finance. *Rowland Egger* 461
State Administration of Natural Resources in the West. *Vincent Ostrom* 478
Technical Assistance and Administrative Reform in Colombia. *Lynton K. Caldwell* 494
The Role of the Military in Middle East Politics. *Majid Khadduri* 511
Partisanship and County Office: The Case of Ohio. *V. O. Key, Jr.* 525
British By-Elections, 1952. *Richard M. Scammon* 533
Book Reviews, Notes, and Bibliography. *Emmette S. Redford (ed.)* 537
News and Notes. *Albert Lee Sturm (ed.)* 609

NUMBER 3—SEPTEMBER, 1953

Research in Comparative Politics
Report of the Inter-University Summer Seminar on Comparative Politics, Social Science Research Council 641
Comments on the Seminar Report 658
The Italian Elections and the Problem of Representation. *Joseph G. La Palombara.* 676
The Democratization of Administration: The Farmer Committee System. *Reed L. Frischknecht* 704
Some Reflections of a Law Professor about Instruction and Research in Public Administration. *Kenneth Culp Davis* 728
Collective Security Reexamined. *Kenneth W. Thompson* 753
The Law of Oligarchy. *C. W. Cassinelli* 773

347926

The Legislative Council Movement in the United States, 1933–1953. *Harold W. Davey* 785
Short Papers
Increasing the Number of Americans Potentially Available for Foreign Assignments. *Walter H. C. Laves* 798
The Independent Voter in 1952: A Study of Pittsfield, Massachusetts. *Philip K. Hastings* 805
Doctoral Dissertations in Political Science in American Universities. *Francis E. Rourke (comp.)* 811
Book Reviews, Notes, and Bibliography. *Emmette S. Redford (ed.)* 843
Publications on Australia Useful to a Political Scientist: A Selective Survey. *Louise Overacker* 844
News and Notes. *Albert L. Sturm (ed.)* 931

NUMBER 4—DECEMBER, 1953

On the Study of Government. *Pendleton Herring* 961
The United Nations and the Political Scientist. *Dag Hammarskjold* 975
The German Social Democratic Party and the International Situation. *Henry L. Bretton* 980
The British Commonwealth: A Symposium
The British Commonwealth of Nations. *H. Duncan Hall* 997
The Nature and Structure of the Commonwealth. *K. C. Wheare* 1016
Nationalism and Democracy in the British Commonwealth: Some General Trends. *Alexander Brady* 1029
Neutralization and the Balance of Power. *Fred Greene* 1041
The Developing Field of International Legal Studies. *David F. Cavers* 1058
The Political Theory Implicit in Social Casework Theory. *Alan Keith-Lucas* 1076
Reason and Power in Benjamin Franklin's Political Thought. *Gerald Stourzh* 1092
Purposes, Procedures, and Outcomes of the Cooperative Research Project on Convention Delegations. *Paul T. David* 1116
A Note on Treaty Ratification. *Carl Marcy* 1130
Book Reviews, Notes, and Bibliography. *Emmette S. Redford (ed.)* 1134
A Selective Survey of Literature on Tibet. *Beatrice D. Miller* 1135
News and Notes. *Albert L. Sturm (ed.)* 1214
Forty-ninth Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association: Transactions of the Council and Annual Business Meetings 1215
The Constitution of The American Political Science Association, 1953 1221
Special Announcements 1236
Index to Volume XLVII. *Emma Rhyne Patterson* 1239

Polit

VOL. XLVII

SOME PR

"Liberalism" is
"conservatism,"
teenth century. It
for have changed
have been for lil
ecclesiastical auth
restraints embodi
productive forces,
from narrow conc
on voting rights a
and association. T
ance from restrain
time as a normal
community, as un

The founding
follows a long tr
Aristotle, that di
prehend reason,
totle continued, i
tinctive function
pleasure"—anima
evil, the just and
cording to Aristo
meant by his nat
organized politic
munity, subject
laws," which are
by a single person

[1] *Politics*, Ernest
Bk. IV, Ch. iv.

PARTY PREFERENCE AND ATTITUDES ON POLITICAL ISSUES: 1948–1951

WARREN E. MILLER
University of Michigan

The widespread interest in understanding the political behavior of the American electorate has been served by a number of different methodological approaches. One of the most widely known and used is the analysis of *aggregate voting statistics* along the lines indicated by the work of Louis Bean. Major problems susceptible to study through aggregate behavioral measures include those related to the consequences of urbanization, population migration, drastic economic crisis or long-term change, or important international developments. Trends in voting behavior and regional differences in voting fall within this type of analysis, with census tract information and political sub-division voting statistics providing much of the relevant data for investigation.

A different approach to the study of political behavior is provided by the analysis of *data on individuals*, information pertaining to the behavior of identifiable persons. This approach allows flexibility in the ultimate units of analysis. The use of data on individuals not only provides such gross information as the percentages of people forming large groups (Democrats and Republicans, well-informed and poorly-informed) in the population, but it also provides information about various characteristics of these groups within the population. And the criteria by which social or political groups are defined need not be restricted to political boundaries. Data are also available pertaining to intra-group changes which may cancel out or otherwise go unnoticed if the level of analysis is confined to the study of aggregate statistics. Inasmuch as our interest is in understanding (as well as predicting) political behavior, these more subtle shifts are the source of important information about individuals and individual differences.

The development of probability sampling and the refinement and application of sensitive interviewing techniques make it possible to gather data on individuals from which valid generalizations may be made for entire populations or sub-groups within populations. The richness of data about individual attitudes and personal characteristics is enhanced by our ability to employ complex analysis designs which allow us to exercise necessary controls in our search for crucial interrelationships.

Much of the better known work in this area has been concerned with sociological or, more narrowly, personal-social data. A great many characteristics such as age, income, education, religious affiliation, occupation, information level, and population class have been studied as variables related to various aspects of political attitude and behavior.

One of the most forceful studies of sociological factors and their relationship to political participation and party preference has been published as *The People's Choice*. The key to the orientation of this study (actually two

studies, since the second edition of the book reports on both the Erie County study of 1940 and a national sample study of 1944) is provided by the authors' statement that "Social characteristics determine political preference."[1] A careful study of the Erie County research and a recent analysis of similar data gathered by the University of Michigan Survey Research Center suggest, however, that, although social characteristics were used to explain party preference in Erie County, the generalized usefulness of such explanation is limited.[2] Manipulation of sociological materials has not produced successful predictions of whether or not individuals will vote. Moreover, such techniques for prediction as were devised by the directors of the Erie County study failed in the SRC study to predict the party preference of some 40 per cent of those respondents who did vote.[3]

The discussion which follows concerns a study which shifts the focus from sociological to social-psychological variables. The use of sociological variables in the study of political behavior must not only be refined, but it must be complemented by the use of some of the other variables which can be expected to play a role in the development of politically relevant attitudes and behavior. Activity such as voting must eventually be studied in the fullest context of all relevant sociological and psychological factors. We shall here be concerned with but one more aspect of this total context: some relationships between attitudes on political issues and expressions of preference for political parties.[4]

Two national surveys conducted by the University of Michigan Survey Research Center provided the data which we shall examine. The first of these was conducted in two parts; the first part preceded the national elections of 1948, and the second part followed immediately after the elections with a reinterview of the original respondents.[5] The second study was a study of national political and economic issues, conducted in June, 1951.[6] Both studies contained requisite information in two areas: a) past and current political party preference of the respondents, and b) respondents' attitudes on policies of the national government.

I

The data concerning political preference in these two studies provided two indicators of party preference. In classifying people as party preferrers, each

[1] P. Lazarsfeld, B. Berelson, and H. Gaudet, *The People's Choice* (New York, 1949), p. 27.

[2] Morris Janowitz and Warren E. Miller, "The Index of Political Predisposition in the 1948 Election," *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 14, pp. 710–27 (Nov., 1952).

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] The data used here are from the series of studies conducted by the Public Affairs Program of the University of Michigan Survey Research Center. For a somewhat different treatment of some of the same data, see George Belknap and Angus Campbell, "Political Party Identification and Attitudes Toward Foreign Policy," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 15, pp. 601–23 (Winter, 1951–52).

[5] A. Campbell and R. L. Kahn, *The People Elect a President* (Ann Arbor, 1952).

[6] Survey Research Center, "Public Reactions to American Foreign Policy" (July, 1951).

individual was described in terms of both a past and current party preference. Consequently, instead of speaking of Democrats or Republicans or Independents or Non-voters (the four basic categories of preference with which we shall be concerned), we shall, throughout the first part of this discussion, refer to Democrat-Republicans (people who were Democratic in 1948 but Republican in 1951) or Non-voting Independents (Non-voters in 1948 who in 1951 still did not express a definite major party preference) or to the 14 other similar groups.[7] Information provided by the 1951 attitude study defined the 16 groups in terms of their responses to two questions: 1) "In the last presidential election about half the people voted and half did not. Did you vote?" (If yes) "For whom did you vote?" 2) "If a presidential election was held today, do you think you would vote Democratic, Republican or for some other party?" The answers to question 1 were grouped to form four categories of people: a) those who had voted Democratic, b) those who had voted Republican, c) those who had voted for a minority party, and d) those who had not voted. The answers to question 2 were also grouped to form four categories: the Democratic, Republican, and Independent (plus a few minor party) preferrers and the potential Non-voters. Each respondent was thus classified twice, and his party preference was defined as a combination of these classifications, thus producing Republican-Democrats, Non-voting-Independents, Democrats-to-Democrats, etc. (In each instance, the first of the labels refers to the respondent's 1948 vote, the second refers to his party preference in June, 1951.)

A central problem of the research was to trace the correspondence between party preference and political attitudes. Before doing this, however, it was necessary to develop a summarizing measure of political attitudes. The attitudes to be used were chosen from the same 1951 study of American foreign policy. In that study the following six questions were asked:

1. "In general are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the way the United States has been acting towards other countries?"
2. "Do you think our troubles with other countries are mainly our own fault or not?"
3. "Do you think the people running our affairs with other countries have done a pretty good job or do you think that some other people could have done better?"
4. "Do you think the United States should send troops to help protect Europe against Communism?"
5. "Do you think we did the right thing in getting into the fighting in Korea last summer or should we have stayed out?"
6. "In the disagreements between President Truman and General MacArthur about how to carry on the war in Korea, who do you think was most nearly right?"

The assumption in ordering attitudes on these items was that responses to this battery or any similar battery of questions about national policies would provide an "index of support for the national administration." This index would be a device by which groups of individuals could be ordered; it would be

[7] For the second study which we shall discuss (see below), the time of the "past" and "current" party preferences is changed to "usual voting behavior" and "vote in 1948," and the same two-fold description of preference is used.

TABLE I

PARTY PREFERENCE GROUPS ORDERED BY INDEX OF SUPPORT FOR ADMINISTRATION POLICIES

1948 Vote	1951 Preference	Index of Support for the Administration $\left(\frac{\text{Number of Pro Responses}}{\text{Number of Pro + Con Responses}}\right)$
No	D	69
D	D	66
R	D*	66*
D	I	60
D	No	56
No	No	55
I	No*	51*
R	No*	51*
No	I	50
I	I*	44*
R	I	43
D	R	40
I	R*	36*
R	R	35
No	R	34
I	D*	22*

* Groups with a very small number of members, creating N's of less than 15 and providing presumptively unreliable indications of group attitudes.

based on the relative amount of support or opposition which members of each group indicated for each separate policy item.[8] An index of support for the

[8] Three means of determining "relative support for the national administration" were tried: 1) the absolute difference between the percentage of the group membership which indicated support for the policy and the percentage of the group membership which indicated opposition, 2) an average rank ordering of the groups derived from combining the rank order of the groups in terms of the percentage supporting an issue within each group

national administration was constructed by summing the responses for each group of party affiliates on all six national policy issues. The percentage of pro-administration support in each group was then computed by dividing the sum of the pro-administration responses on the six issues by the sum of both pro and con responses.

Each group of party preferrers thus received a score based on its attitudinal responses in support of the administration policies and expressed as a per cent of the total number of its attitudinal responses. Following the logic dictated by this concern with only the relationship between the attitudinal commitments and party preference, the "Don't Know" or "Not Ascertained" responses (the responses involving no reported attitudinal commitment) were not used in this scoring procedure.

Table I indicates the first findings when the 16 party preference groups were ordered on the continuum of administration support with respect to the six policy issues enumerated above.

The symmetrical pattern produced by this ordering was one of the most interesting features of the rank order. Also of interest was the apparent demonstration of the efficacy of grouping individuals by party preference in order to bring together people who are homogeneous with respect to political attitudes.

The ordering of the groups of party preferrers by responses to the attitudinal items provided support for one of our most crucial hypotheses. The assumption was made that combining responses to six issues on national policy (issues on which a pro-administration and anti-administration point of view could apparently be distinguished) would provide a pro- to anti-administration continuum. The ordering of groups of party preferrers was interpreted as evidence of a positive relationship between attitudinal commitment and political behavior. To be sure, the precise nature of the relationship was at this point no clearer than was the meaning of the symmetrical array. However, the symmetry of the array reflected a particular structure of types of party preference; and the attitude scores of the groups composing the array suggested that the structure was related to political ideology or attitude structures.

From this it may be deduced that expressions of attitudes on issues of national governmental policy should possibly be considered not merely as attitudinal expressions *per se*, but also as politically partisan acts. If some common factor of political significance had not existed in the six items used in the test, the relationship between party preference and attitude as illustrated by the symmetrical array of party preferrers would not have existed.[9]

with the inverse rank of the groups in terms of the percentage of each group opposing an issue, and 3) the ratio of the number of group supporters to the total number of the group who took a stand on the issue (which could also be expressed as the ratio of the percentage who supported the issue to the total percentage who took a stand on the issue). Inasmuch as we were concerned only with those members in each defined group of party preference who actually expressed attitudes on the relevant policy items, method 3 was used throughout.

[9] The possibility that the particular combination of the six available issues was accidentally responsible for the neatness of the array was examined. Various combinations of

The array positions of these groups of party preferrers could not be readily explained by the available data relating to the personal-social characteristics of individuals. That is, the distributions of age, income, education, occupation, level of interest, information level, religious preference and place of residence (described by five categories on a rural-urban continuum) did not vary among the groups in the manner which would be necessary for those characteristics to be the factors underlying the array. The symmetry of the array cannot be accounted for by any of the above variables.

A possible partial exception to this generalization was found in the age distribution of the ND and NR groups. In these groups, a relatively large number of members were in the 21–24 age group. These were undoubtedly mostly young citizens who could not vote in 1948, but who were taking an active interest in politics in 1951. The young people did not, however, provide the attitudinal responses which placed the entire ND and NR groups in the extreme positions. As a matter of fact, the elimination of the 21–24 age group from the ND and NR groups in the 1951 study resulted in increasing the uniqueness of the attitudinal positions of the remaining ND's and NR's. With the young respondents removed, the ND score rose from 69 to 71, and the NR score correspondingly dropped from 34 to 32 (see Table I).

A review of the political character of some of the 16 groups suggested, however, that the array provides a basis for considering some of the possible relationships between attitude formation and party preference. Two major hypotheses about the relationship between party identification and attitudes on foreign policy have been outlined elsewhere by Belknap and Campbell.[10] Inasmuch as party identification was determined by Belknap and Campbell by statements of party preference in response to question 2 in the 1951 attitude study, above, these hypotheses are relevant to the data under examination. One of the hypotheses holds that "the party serves . . . as a means of instrumenting a point of view regarding foreign policy which [has been] arrived at as a result of a variety of internal needs and external influences (including party activities)." The other proposes that "the party serves . . . as a reference point to which [people] look, consciously or otherwise, for [a guide to] their [own] position on foreign policy questions."[11]

In accord with the first hypothesis, people who currently approve the various actions of the United States in international affairs will express this approval

three or more issues were tested and all of them produced about the same distribution of groups. Some variations were observed in the central portion of the distribution, but it could be assumed that such variance was a product of the decreased reliability which resulted from decreasing the number of issues included in the index. The consistency with which any group of three or more issues produced the same array of political groups can, in fact, be exploited to demonstrate the usefulness of this approach to the analysis of both intra- and inter-political party shifts.

[10] Cited above, n. 4.

[11] Belknap and Campbell give major attention to the second of these hypotheses. Their discussion proceeds from the same general body of data which is under consideration here, i.e., data from the Survey Research Center, June, 1951 survey of the adult population.

of policy by support of the administration and of the Democratic party; those who oppose American foreign policy will indicate their opposition by active support of a party which also expresses opposition to the same policy, in many instances the Republican party. Conversely, the second hypothesis suggests that once a person has become a Democrat, whether through psychological identification or as a formal member or informal supporter, he will subsequently adopt the Democratic position on political issues, including issues involving foreign policy. The supporter of the Republican party will, in turn, acquire attitudes expressing opposition to the foreign policy program of the Democratic party and administration.

It is to be expected that neither of these hypotheses can serve alone as an adequate explanation of the relationship between attitude and party preference. Rather, we can expect that various types of political change, in attitude or party preference, will be variously related to one or the other of these major theses about political activity.

For example, the hypothesis that support of a party is dependent upon the congruence of attitudes of the supporter and policies of the party may be suggested as an explanation for the array positions of the DR and RD groups of party preferrers. To apply the hypothesis, the nature of the change in party preference among the members of these two groups must be deduced, in part, from information not provided by the June, 1951 survey. Of major importance is the fact that since 1948 there has been a change in the leadership of the Republican party. There has also been a diminution of the bi-partisan character of American foreign policy and an accentuation of party differences on foreign policy. Thus, it may be that some of those Democratic voters of 1948 who were not in favor of the policy acts undertaken with bi-partisan support, and some of those Republicans of 1948 who *were* strong supporters of those same policy actions have since been faced with a change in the political stage upon which they must play. The Democratic voters have been presented with an opportunity to express their dissatisfaction with foreign policy, and they now prefer the Republican party because a leading faction of that party promises policy more in line with their own long-standing attitudes. The Republican voters, in turn, have been forced to switch to the Democratic party to establish allegiance, once more, with a party whose foreign policy is acceptable to them.

The data do not provide direct verification that this explanation does, in fact, apply to a majority of the members of the DR and RD groups. It could be argued, for example, that a random distribution of the 1948 voters could be expected to produce as many party changers as non-changing regulars (assuming that all 1948 Democrats and Republicans chose, at random, to prefer either the Democratic or Republican party in 1951). Some of the party changers who were isolated in this study may have been only those people for whom random, unknown factors were relevant to party preference. A much more precise thesis has been advanced which holds that party switchers are politically uninvolved and uninterested.[12] Consequently, they are given to changing party preference

[12] See *The People's Choice*, p. xviii.

rather capriciously. However, both of these explanations of party switching fail to account for the relative positions of the DR's and RD's in the total array. Attitudinally, these groups are almost as extreme as the regular party members, the DD's and RR's. Had the DR's and RD's been relatively neutral in their attitudes on foreign policy, either the "random distribution" thesis or the "uninvolved and uninterested" explanation might have seemed adequate to account for the change in party preference. The clarity of both groups' attitudinal positions suggests, however, that, for a preponderance of these people, party did serve as an instrumentality, a means of expression, for attitudes on foreign policy.

The discovery that the DD's and RR's occupied extreme positions in the array was not unexpected. These two groups can probably be accurately described as composed, by and large, of reliable "party regulars." Individuals whose involvement in politics is minimal might be expected to avoid admitting either having voted for the losing party in the last election or preferring the party currently (at the time of the survey) under severe, even violent criticism. The RR's did not disassociate themselves from the unsuccessful party of 1948, and the DD's did not disassociate themselves from the party suffering attack from many quarters on many issues. We do not know whether the DD's and RR's wavered or shifted between November, 1948 and June, 1951, but after two major political events, the presidential election and the dismissal of MacArthur, member of both groups apparently maintained a consistent party preference.

DD and RR party preferrers were, moreover, quite homogeneous attitudinally and provided strong support for the foreign policies of their respective parties. Also, it should be recalled that foreign policy was not an overt political issue during the 1948 election campaign. Consequently, although we know nothing of these people's party preference prior to 1948, we can assume that choice of party in that year was not necessarily motivated by attitudes on foreign policy issues. As Belknap and Campbell point out, the highly partisan character of foreign policy in 1951 was unmistakable, and, as Table I indicates, the attitudes of the DD and RR members on foreign policy clearly reflect the newly established partisan positions. Thus, it may in turn be suggested that party served as a guide to, or a source of, attitudes on foreign policy for a preponderance of DD's and RR's.

For the groups not yet discussed, we must be less specific in our speculations about their possible relation to the hypotheses. In support of the "party as an instrumentality" hypothesis, perhaps the most that could be concluded about the ND's and NR's would be as follows: A combination of internal and external changes between 1948 and 1951 resulted in making support of a political party appropriate for the expression of newly salient attitudes on political affairs. A newly perceived importance of foreign policy could, of course, produce an enthusiasm and fervor which would be manifested in a high proportion of party-oriented attitudes. Recently acquired attitudes on politically partisan issues may have pushed the members of the ND and NR groups over the "threshold" of political participation. Choosing parties as vehicles for desired participation

could be expected to follow. There are, however, equally valid reasons for assuming that the "party as a source" hypothesis is involved in explaining the ND and NR array positions. In the first place, *operationalizing* party identification by using only voting or voting intention as evidence of identification is unduly restricting. Although there has been but little study of the phenomenon of party identification, it may be assumed that voting is only one of many possible expressions of identification. At this point in the development of political behavior theory, even "avoidable" non-voting should not be interpreted as an absence of party identification. Despite their non-voting of 1948, ND's and NR's may yet be as strongly identified with their parties as are the DD's and RR's. In the second place, no information is available concerning the reasons for the ND and NR non-vote in 1948. Illness, bad weather, inability to meet residence or other legal voting requirements or a host of less common factors may have prevented voting. By intent and desire, the ND's and NR's may have been Democrats and Republicans, respectively, in 1948 who were not able to vote.[13] There is little reason, on the basis of the examined data, to emphasize the greater applicability of either major hypothesis in explaining the ND and NR relationships.

The DI and RI groups may well be people for whom candidates are more important than either attitudes on issues or identification with party. They are predominantly "Independents," in 1951, who professed to base their hypothetical voting behavior on choice among candidates. They do not share the enthusiasm of their fellow party members of 1948 (particularly the DD's and RR's) for the respective party positions on foreign policy. At this point in time they had not wholeheartedly adopted their parties' positions. But, neither did they seem to be searching for a party to express extreme attitudes; the primacy of a candidate in their choosing of a party does not suggest party implementation of an attitudinal position.

The data considered here and in the Belknap and Campbell article are not inclusive enough, however, to rule out the possibility that a still different combination of the two hypotheses can accommodate the somewhat conflicting conclusions which may be drawn from the two discussions. A most obvious gap in the data to which we have referred stems from the absence of information about attitudes related to domestic policies. Although foreign policy attitudes were clearly related to party preference, the relationship may be a function of a third major variable, namely, attitudes on domestic policy. With this possibility in mind, it can be suggested that attitudes toward such issues as taxation, economic controls, communism in government, administrative corruption, or the welfare state may be the factors responsible for changing or solidifying party preference. There is much impressionistic evidence which suggests that such issues are much more immediately relevant to most voters, are much

[13] Although ND and NR scores on support for the administration in 1951 did tend to be more extreme than the scores of the DD's and RR's, the differences were not of a magnitude sufficient to preclude the possibility that sampling error or some other fortuitous factors produced them.

better known through wider personal contact with taxation and controls or through publicity given to communism and corruption, and may thus play the major role in determining party preference.

The absence of data on the June, 1951 respondents' attitudes toward domestic policies and on respondents' evaluations of the relative importance of domestic and foreign policy issues forestalls immediate investigation of this possibility. If, however, domestic policy is, in fact, more important to the American voter than foreign policy, we might conclude as follows: a) Increased relevancy and saliency of domestic policies have, in recent months, resulted in major attitudinal changes. b) Attitudinal changes related to domestic policies have produced marked changes in party preference. c) Changes in party leadership and the international situation have, at the same time, accentuated party differences on foreign policy. d) Following the domestic policy-inspired changes in party preference, attitudes on foreign policy have been acquired by the new party members.

This argument, however, seems much more appropriate as an explanation of the DR and RD switches or the ND and NR activation than as an explanation of the differential attitudinal positions occupied by the total range of party preferring groups. In fact, to infer that the observed ordering of the sixteen groups of party preferrers on attitudes toward foreign affairs was basically an ordering on attitudes toward domestic affairs is to infer a clear-cut relationship between these attitudes which is seldom demonstrable.

In summary, the data examined in this study and in the Belknap and Campbell study strongly suggest that important relationships exist between party preference and attitudes on political issues. The findings from the present study, in particular, accommodate the hypothesis that the party serves as an instrumentality for points of view regarding political issues which have been arrived at as a result of a variety of internal needs and external influences. The data examined here do not provide other than inferential evidence that strength of party preference, or party identification, is directly related to strength or clarity of attitudinal predisposition; moreover, there is basis for only the most general speculation concerning the dependence or independence of party preference on political attitudes. Some portions of the above discussion, and the tabular presentation throughout the study, draw attention to the possible dependence of party identification on political attitudes. Nevertheless, relationships which might be expected to follow from the hypothesis that party serves to guide people in forming political attitudes were also found to exist in the present study. It may be suggested that whatever conflict there is between the two hypotheses and the two interpretations of the data can be resolved in at least two ways: 1) under varying conditions and circumstances, political attitudes and party identification may be of differential importance to people, and 2) different attitudinal areas (such as those relating to domestic policy or to foreign policy) may, at different times, be of differential importance to people. Further exploration of the relation between voting behavior and in-

tention and party identifi
tion on respondents' polit

At this point a replicat
attempting to verify som
tributed to the major fin
from a completely differ
which was mentioned ea
were utilized to provide
These questions were:

1. "Do you think rent co
2. "Some people think t
others say that gover
about that?"
3. "Have you heard any
think ought to be don
4. "In general are you s
been acting toward ot
5. "Some people think th
ing itself with problem
6. "Are you satisfied or d
Russia?"

The questions relevan
voting behavior and voti
ber, 1948 respondents wa
tions: 1) "If you have vo
usually voted Democrati
half the people voted an
vote for?" The responses
of people: a) those who u
Republican, c) those who
party and d) those who
with major party voting
as Independents.

The second phase of th
different sample (althou
American population); r
on satisfaction with Am
time clearly removed fro
same methods were used
tration, and the same ge
both an historically past
ence was followed. The g

The balanced pattern

tention and party identification, and the gathering of more complete information on respondents' political histories are also of paramount importance.

II

At this point a replication of this analysis was essential. Therefore, before attempting to verify some of the more refined meanings which might be attributed to the major findings, the next step involved exploring similar data from a completely different research project, the study of the 1948 election which was mentioned earlier. Again, six questions on national policy matters were utilized to provide the measure of pro- or anti-administration attitude. These questions were:

1. "Do you think rent control should be kept on or should it be dropped?"
2. "Some people think the government ought to do something to control prices and others say that government controls just make matters worse. How do you feel about that?"
3. "Have you heard anything about the Taft-Hartley Act?" (If yes) "What do you think ought to be done about it?"
4. "In general are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the way the United States has been acting toward other countries?"
5. "Some people think that since the war the United States has gone too far in concerning itself with problems in other parts of the world. How do you feel about this?"
6. "Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the way our country has been acting toward Russia?"

The questions relevant to party preference were concerned with "usual" voting behavior and voting behavior in 1948. The classification of the November, 1948 respondents was made on the basis of their responses to the two questions: 1) "If you have voted in a presidential election before this one have you usually voted Democratic or Republican?" and, 2) "In this election, about half the people voted and half of them didn't. Did you vote? Whom did you vote for?" The responses to question 1 were grouped to form four categories of people: a) those who usually voted Democratic, b) those who usually voted Republican, c) those who had voted for more than one party or for a minority party and d) those who had not voted before. Since the study was concerned with major party voting behavior, all respondents in category *c* were described as Independents.

The second phase of the investigation was thus conducted with a completely different sample (although still one representing the adult, non-institutional American population), responding to five different issues (only the question on satisfaction with American foreign policy was asked in both studies), at a time clearly removed from the study first described, 1948 instead of 1951. The same methods were used for constructing the index of support for the administration, and the same general method of defining party preference in terms of both an historically past and a more contemporary expression of political preference was followed. The gross findings are depicted in Table II.

The balanced pattern of pairs of Democratic and Republican preferrers was

TABLE II

Usual Vote	Vote in 1948	Index of Support of the Administration $\left(\frac{\text{Number of Pro Responses}}{\text{Number of Pro+Con Responses}}\right)$
I	I*	74*
No	D	74
D	D	73
R	D	71
D	No	71
No	No	70
I	D	69
I	No	66
I	R	58
R	No	55
D	R*	53*
No	R*	50*
R	R	49
D	I*	40*
R	I*	20*

* Groups with a very small number of members, creating N's of less than 15 and providing presumptively unreliable indications of group attitudes.

again prominent. There were, however, apparent changes from the pattern observed in the first study, including the reversal of order of the RR and NR groups, and the shift in relative position of the ID, IR and DI, RI groups. These shifts and inconsistencies may have been a function of unreliably small numbers within the affected cells in one or the other of the studies.[14]

Barring the above-mentioned differences between the two patterns, it was felt that the constancy with which the larger groups maintained their relative positions further supported the major hypothesis. Attitudes on issues of national policy did indeed provide the basis for a general scale of support for the

[14] See notes accompanying Tables I and II on small cell populations.

national administration. I
larity of ordering among c
were ordered on the basi
attitudes could, in each c
policy promoted by the I
It could be assumed that t
one-half years) was not a

Exploration of the mean
party preferrers is most di
and foreign policy issues.

national administration. In the two different studies there was a marked similarity of ordering among comparably defined groups of party preferrers as they were ordered on the basis of attitudinal commitments. The content of these attitudes could, in each case, be described in terms of supporting or opposing policy promoted by the Democratic administration under President Truman. It could be assumed that the time interval separating the two studies (two and one-half years) was not a causal factor relevant to this stage of the analysis.

Exploration of the meanings which can be attributed to the array of the 1948 party preferrers is most difficult because the attitudes involved both domestic and foreign policy issues. At the same time, the use of both categories of issues

TABLE III

Party Preference Groups		Index of Support for the Administration $\left(\frac{\text{Number of Pro Responses}}{\text{Number of Pro+Con Responses}}\right)$
No	D	70
D	D	69
R	D	68
I	D	66
I	No	63
D	No	62
No	No	61
D	I	60
I	I	57
I	R	54
R	No	53
No	I	50
R	I	43
D	R	42
R	R	41
No	R	35

demonstrates that domestic as well as foreign policy issues provide attitudinal continua on which groups of party preferrers maintain a particular order.[15] This demonstration encourages the assumption that almost any set of issues on national policy (issues on which a pro-administration and anti-administration point of view can be distinguished) can provide a pro- to anti-administration attitude continuum. The major implication of this is that the meaning of the arrays is possibly much more general than our earlier discussion of attitude content suggested. The analysis and replication may be said to have involved two specific instances of the general case in which a random sample of people ordered by attitudes toward the national administration exhibited a unique ordering in terms of party preference. In other words, in two completely different surveys people's attitudes toward political issues were similarly related to their preference for political parties.

At this point it was suggested that combining data from the two specific cases would serve the function of providing larger N's for many of those groups whose scores had been described as unreliable because they had varied from the expected pattern. The reliability of specific group measures would be improved, and a "standard" array of the party preferrer groups could be established. The two studies were, therefore, combined in the same manner by which items were combined for each of the separate study analyses.[16] The combination did, in fact, substantially increase the size of all groups except those forming the pairs ID-IR and DI-RI.

The general case, constructed by combining the two specific cases from the 1948 and 1951 data, is illustrated in Table III. The symmetrical distribution of the various groups was, of course, to be expected inasmuch as the similarity of patterns in the separate studies provided the justification for the formation of the above combined distribution.

The assumption that deviations from the completely balanced or symmetrical array were the consequences of unreliable data seemed to be affirmed. The only deviations in the aggregate pattern were provided by the two pairs of groups,

[15] The analysis of various combinations of three issues (instead of six), as described in footnote 9, was also made on the data from the 1948 study. The results were comparable in that any three issues whether they were three domestic, three foreign policy, or a combination of two of one and one of the other, produced similar orderings of party preferrer groups. Again, variations of rank ordering were observed in the middle-range groups—but it could be assumed that such variance was a product of decreased reliability which resulted from decreasing the number of issues included in the index.

[16] For example, the DR group from the first study and the DR group from the second study were considered as one group of people. They had in common the experience of shifting from Democratic to Republican preference at some time prior to (or, conceivably, during) an SRC interview. Each member of the group had also responded to six items eliciting attitudes toward national governmental policy. The group had 6N opportunities (where N = group membership) to verbalize these attitudes (and thereby demonstrate political partisanship). The group score was computed as the number of pro divided by the number of pro and con responses. Again the DK and NA responses were not included in the scoring because of our interest in relating attitudes and party preference rather than in relating party preference to the absence of attitudinal commitments.

ID-IR and DI-RI. These groups were not greatly strengthened by combining the data from the two studies, and were each reliably represented in only one set of data.

III

This "standard" or "aggregate" array promises to be useful in many studies of political behavior. Instead of restricting analysis of political change, i.e., shifts in partisan allegiance or in attitudinal commitment, to analysis of that change which takes place immediately before an election, the meaningfulness of change over longer periods of time (specifically, at least over three or four year intervals) can be studied. Changes such as those produced by election campaigns can be related to changes occurring during the between-election years. The relationship between change in attitudes and change in political behavior can be studied with some assurance that order, not happenstance, and psychological structure, not socio-economic factors alone, underlie both attitudinal commitment and political behavior.

As suggested earlier, attention can also be focused on different kinds of change. Twelve of the sixteen groups of party preferrers (all except the DD, RR, II, and NN groups) represented types of change ranging from that related to possible minimal involvement (changes from Non-voting to "Independent" preference) to that related to possible maximal involvement (change from voting for party X to voting for party Y). Although changers have been characterized as the politically disinterested and uninvolved,[17] one of the consistent findings of this analysis was that political change was accompanied, or preceded, by very clear attitudinal commitments congruent with the partisan change. The ND's and NR's consistently were attitudinally the most Democratic and most Republican, respectively, of all groups of political affiliates. The party switchers, likewise, as mentioned earlier, had attitudinal scores that closely identified them with the core of their newly adopted parties.

If further study verifies the apparent stability of the order of groups of party preferrers when they are arrayed attitudinally, the information which may be collected on attitudes may disclose much of value about the "politicalness" of suspected issues in party politics. For example, an additional analysis of the 1948 Election Study strongly suggested that while foreign policy was not an overt issue in the 1948 election, the rank and file voters were apparently divided, even then, along party lines on foreign policy questions. By 1951 the partisan differences were much more pronounced, but the change from 1948 was primarily one of degree for many people.

At this point it seems evident that during at least two periods in the past four years, groups of party supporters as defined by two statements of party preference, were uniquely distributed attitudinally on a pro-anti national administration continuum. In projecting future studies greater attention can be given to the search for explanations of the voting behavior of persons within each of the groups forming the attitudinal distribution. This past work can also

[17] See n. 12.

be used as a point of departure for historical or dynamic studies of voting behavior. The problems of studying changes in voting, changes in political partisanship, and changes in attitude on national policies can be conducted with at least one point fixed for comparison.

A SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

It was found that defining party preference by the use of statements concerning past and present political behavior produced groups of respondents which assumed a unique rank order when the groups were placed on a continuum of pro-anti attitudes toward issues relevant to national politics. The rank ordering produced by reference to attitudes toward national governmental policies was observed to be constant (within variations possibly related to the unreliability of small numbers in the groups producing the variations) whether foreign policy issues alone or a combination of foreign and domestic issues were used to elicit the expressions of attitude.

The consistency of ordering existed for two different samples of the national adult population surveyed at two different times, 1948 and 1951. Variations of the kinds of past and present party preferences which could be combined from the data available did not produce significant variations in the ordering. That is, whether past preference was taken to be "usual voting behavior," "vote in 1944," or "preference in 1948," with present preference being either "vote in 1948" or "preference in 1948"; or whether past vote was "vote in 1948" with present preference being "preference in June, 1951"—all of the permutations produced groups which followed the same ordering when ranked by pro-anti attitudes on the selected national policies.